

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

WAHOO FITNESS LLC.,
Petitioner,
v.

BLACKBIRD TECH LLC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR. No. **Unassigned**
Patent 6,434,212 B2
Title: PEDOMETER

**Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 6,434,212 Under
U.S.C. §§ 311-319 and 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.1-.8, 42.100-.123**

***Mail Stop* “PATENT BOARD”**
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. GROUNDS FOR STANDING	4
III. MANDATORY NOTICES AND FEES	4
IV. IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGE	6
A. Relied Upon Patents and Publications	6
B. Statutory Grounds.....	7
V. BACKGROUND OF THE TECHNOLOGY.....	7
VI. THE ‘212 PATENT	8
A. Technology Background	8
B. Prosecution History and Challenged Claims.....	11
1. Parent Application.....	11
2. The ‘212 Patent and the Challenged Claims.....	12
VII. SUMMARY OF THE PRIOR ART	15
A. Amano	15
B. Kato	19
VIII. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	25
A. The <i>Phillips</i> Standard Applies.....	25
B. Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	26
C. “A Step Counter” (Claims 2, 5, and 6).....	27
IX. THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD THAT THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE.....	28
A. Count 1: Claims 2 and 5 of the ‘212 Patent Are Anticipated By <i>Amano</i>	28
1. Claim 2	29
a. “An exercise monitoring device comprising”	29

b.	“a strap for releasably securing the exercise monitoring device to a user”	32
i.	Wrist Band Disclosure.....	32
ii.	Generic Band and Wearable Object Variations	34
c.	“a step counter joined to the strap”	35
i.	Wrist Band Variation.....	38
ii.	Generic Band and Worn Object Variations.....	39
d.	“a heart rate monitor joined to the strap”	40
i.	Wrist Band Variation.....	40
ii.	Generic Band and Worn Object Variations.....	41
e.	“a data processor”	43
f.	“programmed to calculate a distance traveled by multiplying a number of steps counted by the step counter by a stride length that varies in accordance with a stride rate”	43
g.	“wherein the stride length is determined with reference to a plurality of calibrations that each calculate a stride length as a function of a known stride rate”	46
2.	Claim 5	48
a.	Limitations Identical to Claim 2	48
b.	“programmed to calculate a distance traveled by multiplying the number of steps counted by the step counter by a stride length that varies according to the rate at which steps are counted”	48
c.	“and further programmed to derive the stride length from a range of stride lengths calculated from a range of corresponding stride rates calculated from a plurality of calibration samples”	49
B.	Count 2: Claims 2 and 5 of the ‘212 Patent Are Obvious Under §103 over <i>Amano</i>	50
1.	General Motivations to Combine <i>Amano</i> ’s Different Variations	51

2.	“a strap for releasably securing the exercise monitoring device to a user”	52
3.	“a step counter joined to the strap”	53
4.	“a heart rate monitor joined to the strap”	55
C.	Count 3: Claim 6 of the ‘212 Patent is Rendered Obvious Under §103 <i>Kato</i> in View of <i>Amano</i>	57
1.	Motivations to Combine <i>Kato</i> and <i>Amano</i>	58
2.	Claim 6	59
a.	“A pedometer comprising”	59
b.	“a step counter”	63
c.	“a transmitter in communication with the step counter to generate a step count signal corresponding to each step and transmit the step count signal”	66
d.	“a receiver mountable on a user body portion to receive the step count signal transmitted from the user”	67
e.	“a data processor”	70
f.	“programmed to calculate a distance traveled by multiplying a number of steps counted by a stride length that varies according to a rate at which steps are taken”	71
g.	“and further programmed to derive an actual stride length from a range of stride lengths calculated from a range of corresponding stride rates”	72
X.	CONCLUSION	74

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>ClearValue, Inc. v. Pearl River Polymers, Inc.</i> , 668 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	32, 39
<i>Kennametal, Inc. v. Ingersoll Cutting Tool Co.</i> , 780 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	32, 40
<i>In re Klein</i> , 647 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	52, 59
<i>Phillips v. AWH Corp.</i> , 415 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	25, 26
<i>In re Schreiber</i> , 128 F.3d 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	29
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. §102	<i>passim</i>
35 U.S.C. §103	7, 11, 50, 57
35 U.S.C. §112	11
35 U.S.C. §154(b)	25
Other Authorities	
37 C.F.R. §42.15(a).....	6
37 C.F.R. §42.100(b).....	25

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.